UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/768,744	02/02/2004	Christopher Hunter	120-000220US	4909	
QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, P.C. P O BOX 458			EXAMINER		
			WOODWARD, CHERIE MICHELLE		
ALAMEDA, CA 94501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1647		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
				PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/768,744	HUNTER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	CHERIE M. WOODWARD	1647					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 23 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>23 April 2009</u> . A brief in date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or at Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be <u>AMENDMENTS</u>	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			oaase				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,,					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)	-						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	raca sciew or appended.						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,6,11-13,18-21,24-26 and 79</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Cherie M. Woodward/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1647					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claims 21 and 73 overcome the claim objections, but do not overcome the rejections under 35 uSC 102(a),(b), or (e) or the ODP rejection, all of which are maintained. Applicant argues that the claim of benefit is proper. Applicant's argument is not persuasive for the reasons of record, set forth in detail in the Office Action mailed 11/21/2008. In response to the multiple rejections under 35 USC 102(a), (b), and (e), Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach the steps of administration of an IL-27R agonist to a person in need of immunosuppression. Applicant disagrees with the examiner's use of extrinsic evidence used by the examiner in response to Applicant's arguments. Applicant argues that extrinsic evidence should not include references to post-filing date art. Applicant states that they will submit a terminal disclaimer over the claims of the '121 application when all substantive issues have been resolved and the claims are otherwise in condition for allowance.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are repetitious of the arguments submitted in the response filed 8/11/2008 and responded to by the examiner in the Office Actino mailed 11/21/2008. Contrary to Applicant's assertions, MPEP 2124 permits an examiner, in certain circumstances, to use cited references to show that a universal fact need not be available as prior art before applicant's filing date. Such facts include the characteristics and properties of a material or a scientific truism, or that characteristics of prior art products were known, In re Wilson, 311 F.2d 266, 135 USPQ 442 (CCPA 1962). Applicant's arguments to not overcome the rejections of record for the reasons set forth, in detail, of record. Applicant's statements regarding the provisional ODP rejection are noted and the rejection is maintained.

For the purposes of appeal, Applicant's amendments are entered.